1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 10 11 MMCA GROUP, LTD., a Virginia corporation, CASE NO. C06-7067MMC (EMC) 12 Plaintiff, (PROPOSED) ORDER GRANTING 13 **DEFENDANT HEWLETT-PACKARD** V. COMPANY'S ADMINISTRATIVE 14 MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME FOR HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, a CONSIDERATION OF ITS MOTION TO Delaware corporation, PINKERTON 15 CONSULTING & INVESTIGATIONS, INC., a EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF Delaware corporation; BUSINESS RISKS PLAINTIFF'S DAMAGES EXPERT, 16 INTERNATIONAL, LIMITED, an United RANDY SUGARMAN Kingdom corporation, d/b/a PINKERTON 17 CONSULTING & INVESTIGATIONS – [Civ. L.R. 6-3, 7-11] EUROPE, PICA, an Ohio corporation, 18 [No Hearing Required] Defendants. 19 Place: Courtroom 7, Floor 19 Judge: Hon. Maxine M. Chesney 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

## Case 3:06-cv-07067-MMC Document 747 Filed 01/21/10 Page 2 of 2

1 Defendant Hewlett-Packard Company ("HP") has filed an Administrative Motion for an 2 Order to Shorten Time for Consideration of its Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Plaintiff MMCA 3 Group Ltd.'s Damages Expert, Randy Sugarman ("Motion to Exclude"). 4 This Court may grant a motion to shorten time where the moving party identifies "the 5 substantial harm or prejudice that would occur if the Court did not change the time." Civ. L.R. 6-6 3(a)(3). The Court, having considered the Administrative Motion to Shorten Time and the 7 Declaration of Samuel Liversidge in support thereof, finds good cause has been shown to shorten 8 time. On December 11, 2009, the Court continued the pretrial and trial dates in this matter, so that 9 HP could depose Mr. Sugarman and file its Motion to Exclude, with adequate time for this Court to 10 consider the matter before the pretrial conference. Due to Mr. Sugarman's personal circumstances, 11 HP was unable to take his deposition until January 7, 2010. HP filed its Motion to Exclude one week 12 later, January 15, 2010. If HP's Motion to Exclude were to be heard according to the regular 35-day 13 schedule, it would not be heard until February 19, 2010, which is three days after the scheduled pretrial conference in this case. 14 15 IT IS ORDERED that HP's Administrative Motion to Shorten Time for Consideration of its 16 Motion to Exclude is therefore GRANTED. 17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that: 18 1. The hearing on HP's Motion to Exclude shall be placed on calendar for February 12, 2010, at 9:00 a.m. The dates on which the opposition and reply are due remain as though the 19 matter were to be heard on February 19, 2010. 20 OR ALTERNATIVELY: 21 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:** 22 The pretrial conference in this matter shall be continued to-23 3.00 p.m. 24 The trial in this matter shall be continued to 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 January 21, 2010 Dated: 27 nited States District Court Judge 28